



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest
Service

May 2011



Appendix B

MORRISON RUN PROJECT

Scoping Summary

Bradford Ranger District, Allegheny National Forest

Explanation of scoping process

Scoping is the initial part of the public involvement process outlined by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969. The Forest Service publishes scoping proposals for new projects to inform the public of proposed activities and to provide an opportunity for the public to comment on the proposed action. The Forest Service then evaluates the public comments received during the scoping period, identifies any issues related to the environmental effects of the proposed activities and then focuses the analysis or develops alternatives to address these concerns. After finalizing the alternative actions, the Forest Service analyzes potential effects of the actions and compares the environmental, social, and economic consequences of the alternatives. The analysis is then disclosed and further opportunity for public review and comment is provided. The effects analysis for the Morrison Run Project will determine whether or not a more detailed Environmental Impact Statement is required.

The Morrison Run Project was listed on the ANF Schedule of Proposed Actions (SOPA) and posted on the ANF website in April 1, 2010. The project Scoping package was mailed to 213 adjacent landowners, interested individuals, and organizations on November 26, 2010. The information was also posted the same date on the Allegheny National Forest (ANF) website: <http://www.fs.fed.us/nepa/fs-usda-pop.php/?project=31762>

The public scoping period for this project ended on December 31, 2010. Comments were received from 94 individuals in writing via postal mail, electronically via e-mail, in person or over the phone. The list of recipients and their affiliations can be found in the project file at the Bradford District Office (29 Forest Service Dr., Bradford, PA 16365).

Comment analysis

The respondents were organized in alphabetical order by last name and received an identification number associated to their comment letter. Over half of the respondents submitted their comments via a form letter. These were all treated as the same comment letter and are identified as Form Letter rather than with a number (*Note: Additional form letters sent after the December 31, 2010 scoping deadline were added to the project record*). The Interdisciplinary Team (ID Team) and Responsible Official then reviewed each letter and individual comments were identified for issue analysis.

Each comment was identified as a non-issue or issue and a brief rationale was provided for these determinations. This follows Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) NEPA regulations stating that during scoping agencies shall “identify and eliminate from detailed study the issues which are not significant or which have been covered by prior environmental review” (40 CFR 1501.7). Although explanations and additional information are provided for some comments, the scoping process focuses on identifying issues to guide analysis and formulate alternatives and does not require detailed explanations regarding the specific topics of comments.

Comments identified as non-issues included the following categories:

1. Requests for more information or suggestions for the environmental analysis
2. General concerns or opinions that are not related to the Proposed Action's effects, and, therefore, cannot be resolved through consideration of an alternative or mitigation
3. Comments regarding effects of the proposed activities that are (a) beyond the scope of the Proposed Action; (b) irrelevant to the decision to be made; (c) already decided by law, regulation, or policy; or (d) conjectural in nature or not supported by scientific evidence.

Comments identified as issues were those that described relevant and site-specific unresolved conflicts regarding potential environmental effects of the proposed action that could be addressed in an alternative. Comments are evaluated in the context of the specific project area and proposed activities, so identification of issues from similar comments may differ among projects.

The Responsible Official reviewed and approved the scoping analysis and summary documented below.

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
ALTERNATIVES/ANALYSIS				
Form letter 21	N B	...the Forest Service must develop a broad range of alternatives including an alternative that does not use even-aged management practices, expansion of stone pits, herbicide application, and the construction or reconstruction of roads.	Non-issue	This is a statement of opinion pertaining to the application of NEPA regulations. As identified above, significant issues identified during scoping will be used to formulate a range of reasonable alternatives. The Morrison Run Project interdisciplinary team will analyze the effects of a no-action alternative, as required by federal regulation and Forest Service policy. The no-action alternative does not include the activities expressed by the commenter.
6 76	P P	Issue 4.0 The Forest Service Must Acknowledge and Address Significant Issues in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Develop a Range of Alternatives, including a “No Action” Alternative....the Forest Service must consider an alternative that would offset the impacts of oil and gas drilling by reducing other Forest Service actions that impact the environment such as clearcutting and herbicide use. The Forest Service must consider at least one alternative that seeks to offset the impacts of oil and gas development, protects and restores watersheds that have been severely altered by oil and gas development, and maintains species viability.	Non-issue	This project does not include proposed private oil and gas development or the management of existing private oil and gas wells within the ANF. The commenter’s suggestion that clearcutting and herbicide use have only a negative impact on the environment that need to be offset is conjectural in nature and not supported by scientific evidence. The effects of proposed activities will be analyzed in disclosed in the environmental analysis.
11	D	KEEP DRILLING AND CLEAR CUTTING OUT OF THE ANF	Non- issue	This is a statement of opinion.
32 70	A A	As you know, the <i>Citizens’ Wilderness Proposal for Pennsylvania’s Allegheny National Forest</i> (enclosed), including our proposed Morrison Run Wilderness Area (pages 30 and 31 of the proposal- Compartments 447, 448, 449, 450, 451 and 452 of the ANF), received the specific support of more than 6, 800 of 8,200 public comments (greater	Non-issue	This has already been decided by law, regulation or policy. Appropriate activities in this area are already decided by the 2007 Forest Plan. A detailed Wilderness Area Evaluation determined that the Morrison area was not appropriate for wilderness designation and therefore is managed as Management Areas 2.2 and 3.0 (FEIS Appendix C, p. C-25, C-30).

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
		<p>than 80%) on the ANF's Draft Forest Plan in 2006 [followed by a list of other supporters]... Taken together, it can be seen that FAW has substantive standing to suggest reasonable modifications to the proposed Morrison Run Project:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Eliminate all proposed road construction and road reconstruction from Compartments 449, 450, 451, and 452. 		
32 70	B A	<p>[Continued from Comment 32 A] 2. Eliminate all proposed timber management activities from Compartments 449 (cutting units 4 and 7 that lie along the Morrison Trail) and 450.</p>	Issue	<p>All activities along the Morrison Trail proposed in the Morrison Run Project are permissible under the Forest Plan and designed to achieve the desired condition for the Management Area. Additionally, timber harvesting or associated activities along the Morrison Trail would follow Forest Plan standards and guidelines to reduce visual impacts and preserve the trail's recreation potential (Forest Plan p.60-61, 63-64).</p> <p>However, there is a concern that proposed timber management activities will have a direct effect on the recreation experience on Morrison Trail. This concern will be considered a significant issue and incorporated into an alternative that will be analyzed for the project..</p>
32 70	C A	<p>[Continued from Comment 32 A] 3. Eliminate all proposed timber management activities from Compartment 451 west of Forest Road 267.</p>	Non-issue	<p>Already decided by law, regulation or policy. Appropriate activities in this area are already decided by the 2007 Forest Plan. A detailed Wilderness Area Evaluation determined that the Morrison area was not appropriate for wilderness designation and therefore is managed as Management Areas 2.2 and 3.0 (FEIS Appendix C, p. C-25, C-30).</p>
32 70	D A	<p>[Continued from Comment 32 A] 4. Eliminate all proposed timber management activities from Compartment 452 that lie along the west side of Forest Road 267 and along the west side of Forest</p>	Non-issue	<p>Already decided by law, regulation or policy. Appropriate activities in this area are already decided by the 2007 Forest Plan. A detailed Wilderness Area Evaluation determined that the Morrison area was not</p>

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
		Road 177.		appropriate for wilderness designation and therefore is managed as Management Areas 2.2 and 3.0 (FEIS Appendix C, p. C-25, C-30).
32 70	E A	[Continued from Comment 32 A] 5. Eliminate the expansion of the gravel pit along Forest Road 266 (between compartments 450 and 451).	Non-issue	Already decided by law, regulation or policy. Appropriate activities in this area are already decided by the 2007 Forest Plan. A detailed Wilderness Area Evaluation determined that the Morrison area was not appropriate for wilderness designation and therefore is managed as Management Areas 2.2 and 3.0 (FEIS Appendix C, p. C-25, C-30).
32 70	F A	[Continued from Comment 32 A] 6. Though it does not lie within our proposed Morrison Run Wilderness Area, we believe it would be wise to eliminate cutting unit 22 in Compartment 454 which lies along the NCT. Failing that, we recommend that cutting unit 22 in Compartment 454 be divided into two smaller unites bisected by the NCT, with a setback of at least 100 feet to both sides of the trail with no timber management.	Issue	<p>All activities along the North Country Trail proposed in the Morrison Run Project are permissible under the Forest Plan and in accordance with the Forest Service's Memorandum of Understanding with the North Country Trail Association. Additionally, any timber harvesting or associated activities along the North Country Trail would follow Forest Plan standards and guidelines to reduce visual impacts and preserve the trail's recreation potential (Forest Plan p.60-61, 63-64).</p> <p>However, there is a concern that proposed timber management activities will have a direct effect on the recreation experience on the North Country Trail. This will be considered a significant issue and incorporated into an alternative that will be analyzed for this project.</p>
32 70	G A	[Reference Comments 32 A-F] We are fully aware that many of these recommended modifications, in terms of reduced timber harvest, would have to be applied to management Area 3.0 acreage, which in fact is intended for even-aged management under the 2007 ANF Forest Plan. Nevertheless...doing so	Issue	Appropriate activities for Management Areas have been analyzed and identified by the Forest Plan. The effects of the proposed activities on recreation, wildlife, and aquatic habitats will be analyzed and disclosed in the environmental analysis. The suggestion that road reconstruction would exacerbate present forest fragmentation is

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
		would be of great benefit to outdoor recreation enthusiasts, wildlife and the Hemlock Run and Morrison watersheds in general. The ANF should not exacerbate already present forest fragmentation as a result of oil and gas development through the additional road building, road reconstruction, removal of the forest canopy, etc. within the proposed Morrison Run Wilderness Area.		<p>conjectural in nature when these road corridors already exist on the landscape. In addition, the suggestion that removal of the forest canopy to create early successional habitat condition is not universally considered fragmentation in the scientific community.</p> <p>However, there is concern that new road construction will exacerbate present forest fragmentation. This will be considered a significant issue incorporated into an alternative.</p>
63	S	<p>The following specific Compartments and their respective Stands, and associated road construction must be dropped from the Morrison Run Project:</p> <p>Compartment 447, Stands 1 (can't tell what the treatment is from scoping documents), Compartment 449, Stand 7, and 4, and road-building,</p> <p>Compartment 450, 451, 452, All Stands (especially areas over 40 acres), Compartment 453-452, Stands 21, 40, 31 (especially areas over 40 acres), Compartment 454, Stands 44, 22, 49.</p> <p>Additionally, all treatments in Management Area 2.2 must be dropped, and all treatments in 453, 454, and 455 due to their proximity to the headwaters of Chappel Fork and Bump Run. Treatment areas in 446, 441, 442, 443, 456, and 457 must be eliminated from the proposed action if they are in areas that drain into Sugar Bay, Kinzua Bay, and the Allegheny River Reservoir.</p>	Non-issue	<p>Already decided by law, regulation or policy. Appropriate activities for Management Areas have been analyzed and identified by the Forest Plan. The effects of the proposed activities on water quality and quantity will be analyzed and disclosed in the environmental analysis. In addition, all Forest Plan standards and guidelines and state BMPs pertaining to the protection of water courses will be followed. Therefore, this concern has been addressed.</p>
63	HH	The Forest Service Must Acknowledge and Address Significant Issues and Develop a Broad Range of Alternatives	Non- issue	This is a statement of opinion pertaining to the application of NEPA regulations and is not a specific disagreement with the effects of the proposed action.

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
		<p>The Morrison Run analysis must acknowledge and address the significant issues we outline in this document, including Issues 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. Recent analyses in other projects, such as the Coalbed Run project, identified no significant issues, and one alternative that was raised by the public in the scoping period of the project, which is subsequently eliminated because that aspect of concern was removed from the project. Failure to acknowledge and address public comment is a violation of NEPA.</p> <p>In Coalbed Run, the Forest Service presented only two, so-called, alternatives, including the proposed action, and the no-action alternative. The “no action alternative,” is the existing condition of the project area. However, there is never a “no action alternative” in a forest that is managed for industrial extraction like the Allegheny National Forest, which is already heavily impacted by oil and gas extraction and industrial logging.</p> <p>According to the Coalbed Run EA, in the past ten years there has already been 4,769 acres of clearcut activity in the project area. The EA in defining a cumulative effects area simply counted the in-holdings within the project area, not adjacent areas or watersheds that might be affected by the proposed action. The CE area did not include the Hickory Creek Wilderness Area, which is directly adjacent to the project area...</p> <p>The Forest Service violates NEPA when it dismisses issues raised by the public, and develops no reasonable alternatives.</p> <p>The no-action alternative is simply a requirement of Sec. 1502.14 (d), but it does not fulfill Sec. 1502.14 (a), (b), and (c). Further, not developing a broad range of alternatives (especially based on</p>		

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
		<p>the concerns raised above) violates the purpose of the act, specifically Sec. 101 [42 USC § 4331] (b),</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. fulfill the responsibilities of each generation as trustee of the environment for succeeding generations; 2. assure for all Americans safe, healthful, productive, and aesthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings; 3. attain the widest range of beneficial uses of the environment without degradation, risk to health or safety, or other undesirable and unintended consequences; 4. preserve important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage, and maintain, wherever possible, an environment which supports diversity, and variety of individual choice. 		
ANALYSIS				
6 63 76	B F B	The proposed action will devastate a large area of the Allegheny National Forest that provides Wilderness characteristics, is the setting for a national scenic hiking trail and provides multiple high-quality, cold-water streams and naturally reproducing trout habitats. The individual and cumulative impacts of the proposed action meet the requirements of significant impact as defined by 40 CFR 1508.27. ADK respectfully submits that the USFS must prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Morrison Run Project.	Non-issue	This statement is conjectural in nature and not supported by scientific evidence. The commenter does not specifically identify how proposed activities will “devastate” a large area of the ANF. The effects of the proposed activities on recreation and aquatic habitats will be analyzed and disclosed. The effects analysis will determine if an EIS is required for the Morrison Run Project.
Form letter 21	A & B B	The Forest Service must prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Morrison Run Project because the context and intensity of the proposed action meet the requirements of significance as outlined in 40 CFR 1508.27.	Non- issue	This is a statement of opinion pertaining to the application of NEPA regulations. This project does not propose, approve or regulate private oil and gas development. The effects analysis will determine if an EIS is required for the Morrison Run Project.

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
		The context of the proposed action includes the huge impact that oil and gas drilling (including Marcellus Shale gas extraction) has had, and likely will have, in the project area an on the Allegheny National Forest including the massive impacts to water quality and quantity, air quality, the impact from noise (e.g., from compressor stations, trucks, and generators), and forest fragmentation.		
Form letter 21	E B	The Forest Service must prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Morrison Run Project because ... 2) the unknown consequences of the proposed actions (40 CFR 1508.27 (b) 5). The effects of “treatments” like that proposed in the Morrison Run Project have never been studied on forest mycelium on the ANF. Also the “white papers” that the Forest Service has relied on in other logging projects have out-dated or incorrect data, and the data is not NEPA compliant.	Non- issue	This is a statement of opinion pertaining to the application of NEPA regulations and is not a specific disagreement with the effects of the proposed action. The effects analysis will determine if an EIS is required for the Morrison Run Project.
Form letter 21	F B	The Forest Service must prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Morrison Run Project because ... 3) the breaking up of contiguous projects including Southwest Reservoir, Morrison Run, and a logging plan for north of Sugar Bay and Route 321. [40 CFR 1508.27 (b) 7]	Non- issue	This is a statement of opinion pertaining to the application of NEPA regulations and is not a specific disagreement with the effects of the proposed action. The effects analysis will determine if an EIS is required for the Morrison Run Project.
Form letter 21	J B	The Forest Service must prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Morrison Run Project because ... 5) For all of the reasons listed above [items D-I in this document] this project is controversial (40 CFR 1508.27 (b) 4).	Non-issue	This is a statement of opinion pertaining to the application of NEPA regulations and is not a specific disagreement with the effects of the proposed action. The effects analysis will determine if an EIS is required for the Morrison Run Project.

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
Form letter 21 63	K B D	<p>... the 2007 Forest Plan on which the Morrison Run logging project is based never considered (as a significant, primary issue) the impacts of oil and gas drilling (including Marcellus Shale gas) in the development of its management areas and its vegetative management plan. Therefore, analysis of these impacts is not reflected in the decision for the proposed actions in the project area including site-specific treatment areas (defined in the scoping notice for the Morrison Run Project in Tables 1 through 7, and on Maps 1 through 3). Therefore, this project cannot reflect management that is in the best interest of ecosystem health because it is not based on NEPA compliant analyses that consider the huge impact of oil and gas drilling on the Allegheny National Forest ecosystem.</p> <p>The Forest Service must prepare an EIS for this project that analyzes the impacts of oil and gas drilling, including the cumulative effects on local and regional air quality in the context of climate change, and the cumulative effects of noise.</p>	Non-issue	This is a statement of opinion pertaining to the application of NEPA regulations and is not a specific disagreement with the effects of the proposed action. The effects analysis will determine if an EIS is required for the Morrison Run Project.
Form letter 21	L B	Analysis for this project must not rely on analysis that is not NEPA compliant such as the white-papers that the Forest Service has been referencing for other logging projects this year (i.e., Coalbed Run, De Young, and Southwest Reservoir).	Non-issue	Not a specific disagreement with the effects of the proposed action. Analysis for the Morrison Run Project will be presented in the environmental analysis and will incorporate the best available information regarding the effects of Forest Service and private activities on resources within the effects analysis boundary by resource.
Form letter 21	M B	The Forest Service must prepare an EIS for this project to study its presumed need for prescribed fire as a management tool, the need to create early and late structural habitat, and to conduct an actual site-specific level of analysis that focuses on the specific conditions of treatment areas that includes	Non-issue	The scoping notice identified the purpose and need for the project. The effects analysis will determine if an EIS is required for the Morrison Run Project.

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
		data such as stand composition, species surveys in the site-specific treatment areas (e.g. entomological, and mycological surveys, and surveys for the existence of wetlands, vernal pools, forested bogs, springs, etc).		
6 76	M M	...the Forest Service must conduct an EIS to consider the extremely damaging and cumulative effects on regional forest ecosystems of exploitation of the Marcellus Shale gas play. The Forest Service must consider its actions in the context of all of the natural gas exploitation and exploration activities in the two state region.	Non-issue	This is a statement of opinion pertaining to the application of NEPA regulations and is not a specific disagreement with the effects of the proposed action. The effects analysis will determine if an EIS is required for the Morrison Run Project. This project does not propose, approve or regulate private oil and gas development; however, the cumulative effects analysis by resource will analyze and disclose the cumulative effects for the project in the context of other activities, including private oil and gas activities.
6 76	N N	3.6 The Forest Service must conduct a site-specific analysis for the Morrison Run Project in the EIS. The Forest Service has never conducted a site-specific analysis of the cumulative impacts of existing and foreseeable oil and gas drilling that maybe induced or facilitated by the Morrison Run Vegetative Management Project. The Forest Service has never conducted a stand-level, site-specific analysis of the safety and ecological deleterious impact of vegetative treatments to the ecosystems and habitats of the Morrison Run area. Although the Forest Service references the so-called "site-specific" Oil and Gas Development on the Allegheny National Forest (USDA-FS 2010b) this analysis has not yet been provided to the public, and no analysis of the site specific details of current and reasonably foreseeable future oil and gas development exists in the context of the Morrison Run project.	Non-issue	This is a statement of opinion.
6	Q	The Forest Service must recognize oil and gas	Non- issue	This is a statement of opinion.

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
76	Q	drilling as a significant issue in the project area. There is a great potential for increased oil and gas development in the Morrison Run area if logging and road building is approved and expanded in this area. In an area that by great consensus is desired and suitable for Wilderness designation, intensive Vegetative Management should not be approved where that activity would promote and increase the potential for oil and gas development.		
6 76	S S	ADK submits that the USFS should suspend this proposed action given that the entire 2007 Forest Plan is fatally flawed because the cumulative environmental and ecosystem impacts of oil and gas drilling in the Morrison Run area have not been properly addressed and analyzed.	Non-issue	This is a statement of opinion pertaining to the application of NEPA regulations and is not a specific disagreement with the effects of the proposed action. This project does not propose, approve or regulate private oil and gas development; however, the cumulative effects analysis by resource will analyze and disclose the cumulative effects for the project, including private oil and gas activities.
11	B	If this project proceeds it will impair the Forest Service's ability to adequately protect the area from the environmental impacts of Marcellus gas drilling.	Non-issue	This comment is conjectural in nature and not supported by evidence. This project does not propose, approve or regulate private oil and gas development. The cumulative effects analysis will analyze and disclose the cumulative effects for the project in the context of other activities, including private oil and gas activities.
16	F	I would propose that to continue with these projects without a complete environmental impact studies which would be accomplished in an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the for each project (e.g., Morrison Run, Coalbed Run, De Young, Southwest Reservoir, and Pine Bear) while tying them in with the totality of the situation including the impacts on air and water quality, forest fragmentation and the impact on wildlife habitat by the oil and gas industry is in violation of NEPA.	Non-issue	This is a statement of opinion. The effects analysis will determine if an EIS is required for the Morrison Run Project.

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
52	A	We believe the Morrison Run Project to be fatally flawed because the Forest Service has not prepared an Environmental Impact Statement to analyze the impact of oil and gas development on the project area in conjunction with proposed actions since there is not a valid oil and gas analysis currently for the Allegheny National Forest. Furthermore, the impact of Marcellus Shale gas drilling must also be considered as part of the Morrison Run project. The effects oil and gas drilling including Marcellus Shale drilling, will have a negative impact on air and water quality and quantity along with noise pollution affecting wildlife and their habitat.	Non-issue	This is a statement of opinion. The effects analysis will determine if an EIS is required for the Morrison Run Project. The analysis for the Morrison Run Project will incorporate the best available information regarding the effects of the proposed Forest Service activities, including cumulative effects analysis in the context of private oil and gas activities.
63	A	On our field survey in areas we could access on cold, snowy December days, we discovered what we suspected, that there are many site specific details which are not reflected in your scoping materials, such as the existence of prior contiguous clearcuts, the presence of gravel pits (which perhaps, since one of your “treatments” surrounds a stone pit, you have knowledge of future expansion of the pit to build more oil and gas roads, or expansion of the pit for the installation of a Marcellus Shale gas well), tank batteries, oil and gas wells, trucks, rotting OGD infrastructure, current OGD equipment stored on the federal surface, incredible truck and OGD activity. We request that you provide all of the data that you have, that has directed or influenced the project including field survey data, stand composition, data on all prior treatments in the project area, and all conversations and files relating to conversations you have had internally and with other stakeholders regarding the	Non-issue	This is a statement of opinion. The purpose and need for the project, the activities proposed to meet these needs and a description of the existing condition of the project area (including private oil and gas) will be provided in the environmental analysis.

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
		<p>Morrison Run project, the Southwest Reservoir project, and regarding the project that you mentioned that will be north of the Morrison Run project area. These are three contiguous project areas.</p> <p>We request that you suspend this project and other vegetative management projects approved under the 2007 Forest Plan because the failure to include oil and gas as a primary, significant issue during the development of the vegetative plan has created a vegetative plan that does not reflect the impacts of OGD on overall forest health, and fragmentation. In other words you can't meet the requirements of your defined management areas in your plan because you failed to consider the significant impact that OGD would have on the management areas.</p>		
63	G	<p>3.1.1 The Morrison Run Project shows significant local (contextual) short-term and long-term impacts and must be subjected to an EIS. The Federal Regulations quoted by the USFS state, <i>40 CFR 1508.27</i> Significantly. "Significantly" as used in NEPA requires considerations of both context and intensity:</p> <p><i>40 CFR 1508.27</i> Significantly, (a) Context. This means that the significance of an action must be analyzed in several contexts such as society as a whole (human, national), the affected region, the affected interests, and the locality. Significance varies with the setting of the proposed action. For instance, in the case of a site-specific action, significance would usually depend upon the effects in the locale rather than in the world as a whole. Both short- and long-term effects are relevant.</p> <p>Regarding local context for the Morrison Run</p>	Non-issue	<p>This is a statement of opinion. It is unclear how the Project shows significant impacts that must be subjected to an EIS when the Forest Service has not yet completed or disclosed a site-specific analysis for the Project. Consistent with NEPA regulations, the analysis will be completed and disclosed in several months and available for public comment prior to a final decision. The effects analysis will determine if an EIS is required for the Morrison Run project.</p>

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
		<p>Project, The TEIS Part I (in hand proposals for industry planned oil and gas development between 2009 and 2011) shows the Morrison Run Project area being impacted by TEIS Area 4, which includes 2,505 acres of impact from 189 wells and over 24 miles of new road in the project area with associated infrastructure. TEIS area 4b specifically affects the vegetative management proposals, transportation proposals, wildlife habitat treatment proposals, Riparian and Aquatic proposals, and NNIP proposals in Compartments 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, and 454. Additionally, in the TEIS Part II (which would be the reasonably foreseeable future) analysis the USFS predicted that much of the ANF, including the majority of the project area including Compartments 441, 442, 443, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, and 454, 455, 456, would be in “full mine out,” which is wells placed every 500 feet in a grid across the landscape with associated roads, tank batteries, brine and fracking pits, compressor stations, generators, gas lines, electric lines, etc.⁹ The Morrison Run Project area is already impacted by significant oil and gas drilling. Figures 6, 7, and 8 below illustrate the existing wells or well permits in the project area.</p>		
63	H	<p>Further, in what should be within the cumulative effects area for this project, there are other proposed TEIS Part I oil and gas drilling projects areas, including TEIS areas 5 (72 acres impacted)¹¹, and area 3 (971 acres impacted).¹² There is also the Southwest Reservoir Logging Project (1,688 acres of clearcutting, 2,267 acres of releases for diversity, 105 acres additional openings created or maintained for habitat, 1,038 acres of fencing, 1,650 acres of herbiciding, 615</p>	Non-issue	<p>The analysis for the Morrison Run Project will incorporate the best available information regarding the effects of proposed Forest Service activities, including cumulative effects analysis in the context of and private oil and gas activities.</p>

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
		acres of prescribed burning for reforestation, 118 acres of mechanical scarification for reforestation preparation, and 470 acres of understory “enhancements” from fire, chemicals, and mechanical means)		
63	U	Regarding 40CFR 1508.27 (b) 5, “The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.” Mycelium plays an essential role in the Allegheny National Forest and in the Morrison Run Project Area. “Extramatrinal ectomycorrhizal mycelium contributes one-third of microbial biomass and produces, together with associated roots, half the dissolved organic carbon in a forest soil”. Studies suggest that mycelium viability is essential to healthy forest ecosystems including the role it plays in bio-remediation and soil stabilization. However, research suggests that current forest service practices (e.g., the use of glyphosate 42 and fertilizers ⁴³) threaten mycelium viability. The Forest Service must prepare an EIS to study the effects of the proposed action on mycelium.	Non-issue	Effects of herbicide and fertilizer used on soil health have been analyzed in the Forest Plan (FEIS 3-12 and FEIS Appendix G).
63	V	Regarding 40CFR 1508.27 (b) 5, “The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.” There must be an EIS for the Morrison Run Project because DSEIS data relies on outdated OGD data (road miles and # of wells) to make assumptions about future development. The Forest Service relied on road figures from 2003 and oil and gas well figures from 2005 and	Non-issue	This is a statement of opinion. The analysis for the Morrison Run Project will incorporate the best available information regarding the effects of the proposed Forest Service activities, including cumulative effects analysis in the context of private oil and gas activities. The environmental analysis will determine if an EIS is required for the Morrison Run Project.

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
		<p>used that incomplete and misleading data throughout the DSEIS. These figures do not account for thousands of new oil and gas wells that have been drilled since 2005 and at least 800 new miles of new road construction for OGD since 2003. The failure to disclose this easily producible data means that the public has incomplete information and cannot possibly provide accurate and informed comments. In order to accurately analyze cumulative effects, there has to be an accurate representation of the current extent of surface and watershed impacts from OGD. The Forest Service admits:</p> <p>“Since 2005, level of the development has remained high; 985 wells were approved in 2006, while 1,323 were approved in 2007 and 730 approved in 2008. <i>The annual amount for each of these years exceeds the average annual amount included in the future projection.</i> Given the cyclic nature of patterns of development, annual production levels will be closely monitored and evaluated at 5 year intervals.(emphasis added).</p> <p>There is other inaccurate and misleading data in the DSEIS. For instance, Table C-4 falsely states that there are currently only 8,000 wells. Allegheny National Forest Supervisor Leanne Marten recently testified, however, that:</p> <p>“We have approximately 12 to 15,000 existing oil and gas wells on the Allegheny[.]”</p>		
63	Y	<p>Regarding 40CFR 1508.27 (b) 7,</p> <p>“Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance exists if it is reasonable to anticipate a cumulatively significant impact on the environment. Significance cannot be</p>	Non-issue	<p>This has already been decided by law, regulation, or policy. Conditions under which exceeding 40 acres of timber harvest is appropriate are described in the 2007 Forest Plan (p. 68). The environmental analysis will determine if an EIS is required for the Morrison Run Project.</p>

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
		<p>avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into small component parts.”</p> <p><i>The USFS attempts to avoid significance by terming 40 acre clearcuts as “temporary.”</i></p> <p>As stated in 40 CFR 1508.27 (b) 7, “Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary” The forest service attempts to describe 422 acres of clearcuts in over 40 acres as “temporary openings,”</p> <p>“In order to restore these stands to healthy forest conditions, there are several stands, when combined,that would result in temporary openings exceeding 40 acres.”</p> <p>Potential impacts from the proposed creation of these large openings by clearcutting must be examined in an EIS.</p>		
63	Z	<p>Regarding 40CFR 1508.27 (b) 7, [Reference Comment 63 Y above]. The USFS is attempting to avoid acknowledging the cumulative significant impacts of multiple federal actions, including the proposed action of the Morrison Run Project, the Southwest Reservoir Project, located on the south side of Chappel Bay; and a yet un-announced project which was mentioned to ADP on December 16, 2010 by Matt Trager, in the Bradford Ranger District Office, but is not yet in the SOPA. These contiguous projects should be considered as one major action and scoped together as one project.</p> <p>Further, in few areas that we could access during the scoping period in December 2010 by the few un-gated roads, and via limited foot travel possible on gated roads, it became clear that there may be prior contiguous vegetation treatment areas that have been clearcut for areas now proposed for clearcut and even-aged management activities</p>	Non-issue	<p>This is a statement of opinion. The “un-announced” project mentioned by Matt Trager has not been developed in any way at this point in time. The cumulative effects analysis for the Morrison Run Project will be consistent with all federal laws and regulations. At the time of scoping, the environmental analysis for this project had not been completed or disclosed, so it is not accurate to suggest that the Forest Service is “attempting to avoid acknowledging the cumulative impacts of multiple federal actions....”</p> <p>The environmental analysis will determine if an EIS is required for the Morrison Run Project.</p>

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
		(Figure 25). The impact of the three contiguous projects must be analyzed in an EIS with the impacts of previous and ongoing logging and treatment activities.		
63	CC	<p>The USFS must prepare an EIS to study the proposed action in the context of cumulative effects and climate change.</p> <p>According to Maria Janowiak from the Northern Institute Of Applied Carbon Science speaking at the Allegheny National Forest Climate Change Conference held in Warren in May of 2009, climate is changing, management needs to adjust to cope with climate change, and adaptation requires actions to moderate the vulnerability of forests to climate change. Projections for the Allegheny and Pennsylvania in general are warmer winters with more precipitation, drier summers with more late seasonal droughts.</p> <p>The Forest Service totally ignored the synergistic effect of air pollution, acid deposition and climate change along with massive land disturbance from OGD. The Allegheny National Forest needs both “resistance” to improve the defenses of the forest against the effects of change and “resilience” to accommodate gradual change to return to a prior condition after disturbance.</p> <p>The Pennsylvania Climate Change Assessment identified that Pennsylvania needs to manage for healthy, resilient forests with a high degree of biodiversity to deal with climate change. The bottom line in carbon sequestration is maintaining sustainability. A healthy functioning ecosystem (ecology/soils) is necessary to sequester carbon. Managers need to plan for the worst CO2 emissions (high) and encourage lower emissions.</p> <p>The North American Carbon Stocks and Fluxes</p>	Non-issue	Climate change effects were considered in the FEIS (3-83) and the Record of Decision states that “the LRMP provides for maintaining a diversity of plant and animal communities that will enhance the resiliency of the forest to respond to these changing conditions” (ROD-24). The effects of the alternatives on creating habitat diversity will be analyzed and disclosed in the Morrison Run environmental analysis. The environmental analysis will determine if an EIS is required for the Morrison Run Project.

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
		<p>rates Forests highest for carbon sequestration at 222 Metric tons per Hectare.</p> <p>The most basic forest mitigation concepts require emissions avoidance,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - by avoiding deforestation through land use change and reducing catastrophic disturbance. - by sequestration through afforestation – putting land back to forest and forest management with an emphasis on carbon storage (increasing the length of rotation cycle) <p>– timber vs. pulpwood.</p>		
63	DD	<p>The USFS must prepare an EIS to study its presumed need to use prescribed fire as a management tool</p> <p>There is no fire threat in the Allegheny and the Forest Service knows it. The term “wildland-urban interface” is virtually unknown in the northeastern U.S. and for good reason – there is no wildfire threat. The reason the term “wildland-urban interface” is inappropriate for the Allegheny is clear.</p> <p>The term clearly refers to areas primarily in the western U.S. where there are significant “wildlands” that are increasingly encroached upon by private development around their perimeters. The Allegheny is nothing like this as the area was already extensively developed prior to the national forest being designated. Thus, there really is no “interface” as the entire Allegheny has extensive communities and camps scattered on private in-holdings throughout the forest.</p>	Non-issue	<p>This is a statement of opinion. The purpose and need for this Project identifies the need to use prescribed fire as a management tool. The 2007 Forest Plan identifies appropriate use of prescribed fire as a silvicultural technique and as a management tool in oak-dominated forests (Forest Plan Appendix A-32). The environmental analysis will determine if an EIS is required for the Morrison Run Project.</p>
ECONOMIC				
16	B	<p>It is totally absurd to prepare plans and allocate tax dollars and human resources to improve wildlife habitat, promote forest regeneration and</p>	Non-issue	<p>This is a statement of opinion.</p>

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
		vegetation management, and develop recreational areas, ex. North Country Trail, when it is known and can be documented that the oil/gas industry will simply destroy it.		
16	C	I will go a step further and suggest that many of these projects are simply to accommodate the oil/gas industry. For example, the oak release i.e. clear cutting in Kinzua Heights (446) with road reconstruction. This is already a U.S Energy oil field and the road is their road not a USFS road. Why would the USFS suggest using taxpayer dollars and forestry resources to bring this road up to “forestry standards”? Why reconstruct these roads when the public does not have access on them? That is their responsibility to conform to USFS standards.	Non-issue	This is a statement of opinion.
16	D	The USFS has a history of accommodating the oil/gas industry. They were permitted to take the rock from areas all over the ANF creating hundreds of gravel pits to build their roads. ... The proposal discusses the reclamation of some of these pits and again that should be the responsibility of the oil/gas companies that created the mess for their private use.	Non-issue	This is a statement of opinion.
35	A	There is a tremendous amount of silt going into the streams from roads- How permanent do roads have to be for management activities? Why is the FS taking it upon themselves to bring the oil and gas development road system up to Forest Service standards and use tax payer money rather than have the oil and gas companies pay for it?	Non-issue	Already decided by law, regulation or policy. Roads used for Forest Service management activities must be incorporated into the system and maintained according to FS standards.
37	B	The timber program loses taxpayer money and hurts the local economy by reducing the price of timber on private land.	Non-issue	This is a statement of opinion. The economic effects from the activities proposed in the Morrison Run Project will be analyzed and disclosed in the

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
				environmental analysis.
HUMAN HEALTH/SAFETY				
15	C	Slash and other material left in commercial and noncommercial vegetation treatments may increase wildfire risk for nearby communities.	Non-issue	The effects of proposed vegetation treatments, including prescribed fire, on human health and safety will be analyzed in the Morrison Run EA.
15	D	Project does not reduce pollution from oil and gas, including run-off, Marcellus waste water and air pollution Examples: 1) There are strong fumes from an oil storage facility near residential area (approx. 1.5 mi west of Rt. 59 on Old State Rd). 2) Risk of water pollution from storage of Marcellus fracking water in underground tanks in or near the project area.	Non- issue	This project does not propose, approve or regulate private oil and gas development. These concerns should be directed to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, which regulates private oil and gas development in the State of Pennsylvania.
16	A	As someone who resides in the Allegheny National Forest, Kinzua Heights, I was sent a copy of this proposal as it will have a direct, everyday impact on my family's quality of life...What is completely obvious is that this proposal totally fails to acknowledge or even vaguely mentions the severe, constant and ever increasing (Marcellus) impacts of the oil and gas industry on the ANF.	Non-issue	This project does not propose, approve or regulate private oil and gas development. The analysis for the Morrison Run Project will incorporate the best available information regarding the effects of the proposed Forest Service activities, including cumulative effects analysis in the context of private oil and gas activities.
16	E1	Last spring it sounded like an industrial zone behind my house. When I went to see what was going on with some friends it was quite shocking. Freedom Oil had drilled several wells in Cornplanter Run... As we approached, the smell made us dizzy and nauseous as they were venting large amounts of gas into the air. If we had been smoking we would have been blown to bits. Further down the road they had recently fracked a well and the fracking fluid was clearly in a pit with no liner and the fracking fluid was sprayed all over the trees and vegetation. The USFS claims that safety is a top priority;	Non-issue	This project does not propose, approve or regulate private oil and gas development. These concerns should be directed to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, which regulates private oil and gas development in the State of Pennsylvania.

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
		however, allowing the oil/gas industry to continue with limited oversight is not safe for man nor beast. ...How safe is all this venting gas and tank batteries with underground storage tanks?? I do know that if Old State Road is blocked and there is fire or other incidents we have no way out.		
16	E2	In the summer of 2008 a forest service employee came to our house to advise us Kinzua Heights had been designated “a community at risk”. Apparently this refers to some type of fire threat...	Non- issue	Forest Service staff will follow up with commenter.
24	A	You and the rest of the Forest Service are required to explain to American taxpayers – the “people” and “generations yet to come” in your own mission statements – how allowing the clear-cutting of about 5,000 acres and the adding of “treatment” to nearly 20,000 acres fulfills your mandate to manage and protect <i>all</i> of the area’s natural resources in the public interest. Allowing the removal of thousands of acres of trees is only the first step in an act of destruction in which you have ignored the wishes of everyone except the extraction industries. Clear-cutting and road construction will only enable more resource extraction in the form of gas drilling and all of its poorly-understood environmental ramifications.	Non-issue	This is a statement of opinion. The analysis for the Morrison Run Project will incorporate the best available information regarding the effects of the proposed Forest Service activities, including cumulative effects analysis in the context of private oil and gas activities.
35	B	After logging and new road construction occurs, there is a lot of tinder, or slash, left behind. This could pose a human health and safety risk because if a wildfire began, the people in the Kinzua Heights community would have no way to escape.	Non-issue	The effects of proposed vegetation treatments, including prescribed fire, on human health and safety will be analyzed in the Morrison Run EA.
35	D	There is an air pollution issue where Catalyst Energy tanks are above and below ground near my property and are spewing contaminated water into the air and surrounding vegetation. Who on the Forest Service is keeping a watch on this?	Non-issue	This project does not propose, approve or regulate private oil and gas development. These concerns should be directed to the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, which regulates private oil and gas development in the State of Pennsylvania.

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
63	I	The impact of Marcellus Shale gas drilling must also be considered as part of the local context of the Morrison Run Project regarding <i>40 CFR</i> 1508.27. There are at least 16 Marcellus Shale Gas wells, planned, permitted, or currently under operation within the ANF Proclamation Boundary (at least five of these are on ANF lands). ¹⁵ There will clearly be impacts to the Morrison Run Project area and cumulative effects area from Marcellus Shale gas drilling. ¹⁶ Marcellus gas producers need as many as one compressor for every three producing Marcellus gas wells. ¹⁷ Drilling pads in Pennsylvania may have as many as 10 wells. In Colorado Marcellus Shale gas well pads may contain 30 wells. Compressor stations are located close to the producing wells. Cancer causing formaldehyde and HAPs from these facilities will be major air pollution factors, in addition to noise and other air quality issues.	Non-issue	This project does not propose, approve or regulate private oil and gas development. The analysis for the Morrison Run Project will incorporate the best available information regarding the effects of the proposed Forest Service activities, including cumulative effects analysis in the context of private oil and gas activities.
63	K	The Forest Service must conduct an EIS to analyze a complete analysis of the dangers to the environment and human health of modern gas drilling, including the use of hydraulic fracturing. Scientific reports have been submitted by Damascus Citizens and the Delaware River Keeper Network to the Delaware River Basin Commission during official public hearings. ¹⁹ This research outlines dangers to the environment and human health (see attachments Damascus Citizens Reports 1 to 8). ²⁰ Further, the decision in <i>Stevens County v. United States DOI</i> asserts that when there have already been scientific studies showing that an activity such as oil and gas drilling impairs stream quality, that information cannot be ignored when considering the cumulative effects in the context of an agency's	Non-issue	This project does not propose, approve or regulate private oil and gas development. The analysis for the Morrison Run Project will incorporate the best available information regarding the effects of the proposed Forest Service activities, including cumulative effects analysis in the context of private oil and gas activities.

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
		<p>proposed action. If the consequences of OGM activity on water quality are already known, the Forest Service cannot ignore it.</p> <p>In the Morrison Run project area, oil and gas industry domination of the public surface is blatant and nearly unchallenged by the Forest Service. Industry ignores regulations, including the Pennsylvania Oil and Gas Act,²¹ and the Spill Control Prevention and Countermeasure Regulations²² (see attachments Snyder Brothers in ANF, and Freedom Oil Ventures in ANF). Oil and gas equipment and debris litter the public's surface (Figures 13 through 21 below). Noise and odor blanket the area.²³ Truck traffic is constant on main, paved state roads and on the forest system roads in the project area. The figures below, taken in December 2010 (except Figure 21 which was taken in September 2006) illustrate the attitude of the oil and gas industry toward stewardship of the public's surface (and the failure of the Forest Service to defend the public surface). The oil and gas field workers have been aggressive towards public users in the project area [photos and audio included].</p>		
63	W	<p>The DSEIS [used to complete analyses] also completely fails to disclose the number of abandoned oil and gas wells even though: "[t]hese wells pose hazards to the environment and to human health and safety. Natural gas or oil can flow from an abandoned well and contaminate water sources. Natural gas can accumulate in nearby buildings, and create hazardous conditions. Oil can leak from abandoned wells, causing surface pollution."</p>	Non-issue	This project does not propose, approve or regulate private oil and gas development.

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
63	EE	<p>[R]egarding the use of prescribed burn in an area heavily utilized for oil and gas extraction, with uncounted abandoned wells, pipelines and infrastructure from previous industry development, and with the advent of the highly controversial extraction technique of hydraulic fracturing which most recently resulted in a disastrous well blow-out in Clearfield County, and the migration of methane and other contaminants to the bed of the Susquehanna River where the gas has migrated and is bubbling out; the Forest Service must conduct an EIS to determine the effects of prescribed burning on air quality, and public safety in the context of current and past oil and gas extraction and unconventional hydrocarbon extraction within the Forest boundaries on in-holdings, and within at least two miles of the boundaries of the Forest given the horizontal drilling practices and gas migration potential. Shallow well developments also hold considerable danger. A recent investigation by an ADP Forest Watch team found a new oil and gas drilling operation in the Kinzua Heights area of the ANF freely venting gas from well sites. ADP also regularly finds leaking wellheads, like those we alerted you to on FR 370 in the Yeager Brook Watershed (Report on Yeager Brook and Chander Run sent to Leanne Marten August 27, 2007), the PGE leaking wellhead in Salmon Creek Valley on the North Country Trail, a leaking well head just east of the Atlas tank battery on FR 186 that ADP documented on 10 September 2010, and a leaking pipe at stream crossing adjacent to the Ansler Spring Shelter. These situations lead to disasters like the tank battery fire on RT 321 near the Bradford Ranger District, which fortunately</p>	Non-issue	<p>The effects of prescribed fire on human health and safety will be analyzed and disclosed in the Morrison Run environmental analysis. The environmental analysis will determine if an EIS is required for the Morrison Run Project.</p>

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
		<p>happened during the winter... The Allegheny has also experienced gas line fires in the forest. These conditions endanger all other users of the Allegheny. These leaks and incidences have been happening on the Forest for a long time... Unlike the transmission lines referenced in the Tribune article, which have mercaptan added so that presence of the gas can be detected by odor, the pipelines in the forest hold the same threat but the presence cannot be detected by forest users. Detailed geologic, and public safety studies must be conducted in an EIS. Cumulative impacts to air quality from OGM development across the forest have never been assessed and must be addressed in an EIS. The SEIS OGM for the 2007 Forest Plan and the public comment process have not been completed.</p>		
HYDRO/SOILS				
6 76	O O	<p>If the consequences of OGM activity on water quality are already known, the Forest Service cannot ignore it. Such is the case of the 2007 Forest Plan Biological Evaluation, which includes two tables analyzing the sediment load of two tributaries to the Allegheny River. One tributary, Grunder Run, has extensive oil and gas development surrounding it. The other tributary, Hedgehog Run, is located in the Allegheny Front National Recreation Area and has no oil and gas development around it yet. The results clearly document that the tributary with more oil and gas development around it has higher sediment loads, thus impairing stream quality and aquatic habitat. There is no analysis or discussion of existing, site-specific oil and gas impacts in the context of the proposed site-specific “vegetative treatments”</p>	Non-issue	<p>The cumulative effects of the proposed activities in the context of present and projected private oil and gas activities on various resources, including water quality, will be described in the Morrison Run environmental analysis.</p>

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
		(AKA clear cuts, herbicide use, proscribed, burning, fencing).		
15	A	Run-off from proposed timber harvesting, new and existing FS roads and private oil and gas development would reduce water quality in streams and the Allegheny Reservoir Example: During heavy rain event in Nov. 2010 the oil and gas roads in the area (near the intersection of Rt. 59 and Old State Rd) experienced major erosion near stands proposed for timber harvesting.	Non-issue	The suggested effects are conjectural and not supported by scientific evidence. This project does not propose, approve or regulate private oil and gas development. Effects of proposed activities on water quality will be analyzed and disclosed in the Morrison Run environmental analysis.
24	B	The Morrison Run Project also displays an ignorance of the other natural resources – beyond trees and gas – that are offered by an intact forest, most notably ecosystem services like watershed purification.	Non-issue	This is a statement of opinion. The project includes multiple-use management activities.
35	C	This is a multiple-use forest, however, oil and gas have taken over areas (picture)- why can oil and gas operators do as they please and have large holding tanks above ground, explode large areas for pit material and have poorly designed roads and yet the public cannot put out a small ice shanty? Oil and gas operators can even get away with breaking weight limits on roads (Kinzua Heights). And what about all the water there are taking from the local streams? Why isn't anyone on the Forest reporting illegal activity to DEP?	Non-issue	This project does not propose, approve or regulate private oil and gas development.
63	L	The Forest Service must consider the cumulative effect of water withdrawals for oil and gas drilling and fracking (both shallow and deep wells) in the project area, and in a redefined cumulative effects area. Further, the USFS must, as riparian owners, stop the illegal withdrawals of surface water by the oil	Non-issue	This project does not propose, approve or regulate private oil and gas development. Beyond the scope of the proposed action. The cumulative effects of the proposed activities in the context of current and projected private oil and gas activities on various resources, including water

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
		<p>and gas industry on the ANF. (see attached letters to John Hanger, July 26, 2010 and November 15, 2010; and letter to Leanne Marten, August 13, 2010). Under Pennsylvania riparian common law, only the riparian landowner has the right to withdraw water from sources on their land for their uses on that particular property. The Pennsylvania Supreme Court has made clear that “[T]he diversion of water from its natural course in a stream by a riparian owner for purposes other than those incident to the proper enjoyment of the riparian land is unlawful. The upper riparian owner has a right to the use of the water of the stream on his land for any legal purpose, provided he returns it to its channel without contamination or substantial diminution[.]...”</p> <p>If an oil and gas company operating on the Allegheny National Forest throws a hose into a river, stream or pond to withdraw water for its oil and gas drilling activities, that company is engaging in unlawful conduct, regardless of any “permit” issued by the DEP. In other words, the Forest Service has an obligation to prohibit private oil and gas companies from taking water that they have no legal right to.</p>		quality, will be analyzed and disclosed in the environmental analysis.
MANAGEMENT AREAS				
6 76	A A	ADK notes that the Morrison project area is located within the forest areas proposed for Wilderness designation in <i>A Citizens’ Wilderness Proposal for Pennsylvania’s Allegheny National Forest</i> by the Friends of Allegheny Wilderness. The USFS must also analyze the impact of the proposed action on the proposed Chappel Fork Wilderness Area proposed by the Allegheny Defense Project. The identification of the project	Non-issue	This has already been decided by law, regulation or policy. Appropriate activities in this area are already decided by the 2007 Forest Plan. A detailed Wilderness Area Evaluation determined that the Morrison area was not appropriate for wilderness designation and therefore is managed as Management Areas 2.2 and 3.0 (FEIS Appendix C, p. C-25, C-30).The effects of the proposed action on resources in the project area will be analyzed and disclosed in the

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
		area for Wilderness designation by two stakeholders must be heavily weighted when evaluating the intensity of the action pursuant to 40 CFR 1508.27 (b) 3.		Morrison Run environmental analysis.
6 76	L L	...the habitat that is in short supply is remote, unfragmented older growth forests. ADK submits that the U.S. Forest Service's management priorities should be creating more old growth, late succession forest.	Non-issue	This has already been decided by law, regulation or policy. Designation of Management Areas and their desired conditions are described in the 2007 ANF Forest Plan. A large portion of the project area is in MA 2.2, which focuses on maintaining or enhancing late-structural forest linkages.
7	A	With 55% of the Morrison Run project area remaining in Management Area 2.2 (Late Structural Linkages), the western portion of the project site will be critical to support landscape level connectivity for flora/fauna that rely on the complex structure available in later successional stages. However, the management planning that is proposed for the Morrison Run project appears to occur at the stand and compartment level and does not specifically incorporate a larger landscape level planning mechanism... we believe landscape level planning should remain an integral part of the process to help determine the location and techniques for silvicultural and management strategies at the stand and compartment levels.	Non-issue	The ANF Forest Plan was written from the landscape-level perspective with each management area providing the guidelines to accomplish these landscape-level goals (p. 109). Forest Service management objectives for each management area are considered in order to assess the current condition of each MA. Next, field reconnaissance determines where these management goals can be achieved based on the overall stand health, forest-type, stand age, stocking levels and other variables. An assessment of the existing and projected future condition for the Morrison Run Project area will be discussed in the environmental analysis.
7	B	We consider landscape level planning and the inclusion of connectivity issues important not only for the MA2.2 areas, but also, and perhaps even more significantly, for the MA3.0 (Even-aged Management) areas. For example, the network of shelterwood harvests occurring in Compartments 449-454 could perhaps benefit from increased stand/compartment level landscape planning. Focusing on one specific border between Compartments 450 & 451, harvests tend to	Non- issue	The ANF Forest Plan was written from the landscape-level perspective with each management area providing the guidelines to accomplish these landscape-level goals (p. 109). Forest Service management objectives for each management area are considered in order to assess the current condition of each MA. Next, field reconnaissance determines where these management goals can be achieved based on the overall stand health, forest-type, stand age, stocking levels and other variables.

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
		alternate across the Compartment boundary. Would it have been more appropriate to concentrate harvests on one side of the road/boundary to lessen possible fragmentation effects? These are the types of questions we believe should be considered in the planning process.		An assessment of the existing and projected future condition for the Morrison Run Project area will be discussed in the environmental analysis.
11	A	The project will jeopardize possible future designation of this area as Wilderness.	Non-issue	This issue has already been decided by law, regulation or policy. Appropriate activities in this area are already decided by the 2007 Forest Plan. A detailed Wilderness Area Evaluation determined that the Morrison area was not appropriate for wilderness designation and therefore is managed as Management Areas 2.2 and 3.0 (FEIS Appendix C, p. C-25, C-30). The effects of the proposed action on resources in the project area will be analyzed and disclosed in the Morrison Run environmental analysis.
63	T	Regarding 40CFR 1508.27 (b) 4, “The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial.” The USFS must analyze the impact of the proposed action on the proposed Chappel Fork Wilderness Area proposed by ADP (with over 2,000 supporters for the proposed wilderness area) and the Morrison Run Wilderness Area proposed by the PA Wilderness Coalition (with almost 7,000 supporters of the wilderness area). The identification of this area by two stakeholders with collectively over 9,000 supporters of the Morrison Run project area for a Wilderness Area must be considered when evaluating the intensity of the action regarding 40 CFR 1508.27 (b) 4.	Non-significant issue	This issue has already been decided by law, regulation or policy. Appropriate activities in this area are already decided by the 2007 Forest Plan. A detailed Wilderness Area Evaluation determined that the Morrison area was not appropriate for wilderness designation and therefore is managed as Management Areas 2.2 and 3.0 (FEIS Appendix C, p. C-25, C-30). The effects of the proposed action on resources in the project area will be analyzed and disclosed in the Morrison Run environmental analysis.
PROCESS				
6	T	The Forest Service will violate NEPA if it fails to	Non-issue	This is a statement of opinion. The Responsible

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
76	T	conduct an EIS for the proposed Morrison Run Project.		Official is following NEPA laws and regulations. The environmental analysis will determine if an EIS is required for the Morrison Run Project.
11	C	The next step should be a comprehensive Environmental Impact Statement with at least one public hearing.	Non-issue	This is a statement of opinion. The Responsible is following NEPA laws and regulations. The environmental analysis will determine if an EIS is required for the Morrison Run Project.
20	A	The 2,400 member Western New York, Niagara Group of the Sierra Club believes this action to be a wasteful mistake and with this letter we go on record in opposition to it.	Non-issue	This is a statement of opinion.
21	A	We request that the Forest Service issue a revised press release, scoping document package and legal notice in the Bradford Era in January 2011 for the Morrison Run project and ensure that all of these documents and notices inform the public and Interested Parties of a consistent deadline date for the receipt of scoping comments [December 24, 2010 in the news release posted on the website and December 31, 2010 in the legal notice and package cover letter]. We request that the deadline date be 30 days from the publication of the revised legal notices in the Bradford Era newspaper.	Non-issue	The document titled “Morrison Run Scoping News Release” posted on the ANF website (http://www.fs.fed.us/r9/forests/alleggheny/projects/vegetative_management/Morrison_run/index.php) contained the Scoping comment deadline of December 24, 2010 in error. However, the published news release, the Legal Notice, the cover letter mailed to Interested Parties and the cover letter posted on the website had a date of December 31, 2010. In addition, the documents were posted to the website on November 26, 2010, well within the 30 days you request.
24	C	The public servants involved in this process are also required to explain why the Morrison Run Project is necessary in relation to the mission statement of the US Forest Service and the resource management requirements of the National Forest Management Act. The Morrison Run Project has also shamefully avoided full environmental impact statements and public outreach processes, which are possibly violations of the National Environmental Policy Act, the Government in the Sunshine Act, and the Freedom of Information Act...This process must not be	Non-issue	This is a statement of opinion. This purpose and need for this project was identified in the scoping notice and is consistent with the Forest Service mission, the ANF 2007 Forest Plan, and all federal laws and regulations.

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
		allowed to proceed without proper observation of, and adherence to, the many federal statutes that regulate the activities of the US Forest Service. More fundamentally, an explanation is required for how the Morrison Run Project benefits the Forest Service's constituents – beyond the resource extraction industries and their lobbyists.		
63	B	You also could have posted the “white paper” information on your website since it is, and has been, an essential part of the analysis that you have been relying on for the proposed logging projects this year on the ANF.	Non-issue	The white papers have been available either as an appendix to projects which utilized this information or through the project file available to the public in the Bradford Ranger District Office. This information was provided to the commenter upon request.
63	C	The Forest Service must prepare an EIS for this project to conduct an actual site-specific level of analysis that focuses on the specific conditions of treatment areas and includes data such as stand composition, species surveys in the site-specific treatment areas (e.g., entomological, and mycological surveys, and surveys for the existence of wetlands, vernal pools, forested bogs, springs, etc). These data were not provided during the scoping process, in the scoping package. Without this site-specific data it is difficult for the public to raise important issues during the scoping stage. Further, the time of year the project was scoped, November 30 to December 31, effectively blocked access to most of the project area since many of the roads leading to the site-specific treatment areas are blocked with snow. Those Forest Service roads that are clear due to oil and gas activity are gated and unavailable for the public to travel and view the areas except by foot travel in frigid temperatures. ADP requested access to gated, cleared roads, but were denied access by the Bradford District Ranger despite our offer to	Non-issue	This is a statement of opinion and includes other false information. All areas of the project are accessible either by vehicle or by foot travel. All project information is available upon request.

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
		acquire a special use permit as other members of the public do for access on gated roads. ADP also requested site-specific data, more than a map of stand areas in the context of roads and major streams (e.g., entomological, and mycological surveys, and surveys for the existence of wetlands, vernal pools, forested bogs, springs, etc). The Bradford District Ranger informed us that this data would take time to gather and make available to us (see attachment Correspondence with Bradford District Ranger).		
63	E	The analysis for the Morrison Run Project cannot rely on unpublished, unfinished analyses which themselves have not completed the NEPA process. Two documents, which are not NEPA compliant, have been relied on in the other four logging projects being processed this year including, Pine Bear, De Young, Southwest Reservoir, and Coalbed Run. These projects rely on, or tier to, or incorporate by reference, the Programmatic Effects of Private Oil and Gas Activity on the Allegheny National Forest (USDA-FS 2010, unpublished) [the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS)] and Site-Specific Oil and Gas Development on the Allegheny National Forest (USDA-FS 2010, unpublished) [the Transitional Environmental Impact Statement (TEIS)].... For this reason the Coalbed Run EA, and the other project analyses that have, or will, rely on, tier to, or incorporate by reference, analysis in the SEIS, or the TEIS (or the “white papers” referenced above that are the results of the SEIS and TEIS to date) are invalid and those projects must be suspended until NEPA compliant analyses are done which include analyses of the site-specific treatment areas at the stand level.	Non-issue	Not a specific disagreement with the effects of the proposed action that can be addressed in an alternative to the proposed action or through mitigation. The environmental analysis will incorporate the best available science. The Forest Service has and will continue to follow NEPA procedures. As the commenter is aware and our environmental analyses have stated, these documents are available in the project record for public review.

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
63	GG	The Forest Service must also acknowledge that the current Forest Plan is an industrial logging plan with 90% of the Forest available for even-aged management (AKA clearcutting), which is fulfilled at the expense of all other uses of the forest (excepting perhaps the industrial extraction of oil and gas). This is part of the Forest Service's goal to raise the ASQ from 23 MBF/year back up to 56 MBF/year—returning us to the high level of cutting in the 1990s, but now overlain with unregulated, rampant oil and gas development. This is in spite of District Ranger Scardina's attempt, at the recent Southwest Reservoir Appeal Resolution conference with ADP on September 20, 2010, to mask the proposed commercial logging projects as necessary for forest health. The focus of the Forest Service on industrial extraction for the ANF violates the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), National Forest Management Act (NFMA), Multiple-Use and Sustained-Yield Act (MUSYA) and Endangered Species Act (ESA).	Non-issue	This is a statement of opinion.
RECREATION				
6 76	C C	The USFS must analyze the impact of the proposed action on the setting and user experience of hikers and backpackers using the Rimrock trail, the North Country Scenic Trail, and the Morrison Run Trail, which are within the project area.	Non-issue	This is a suggestion for the environmental analysis. The effects of the proposed action on recreation will be analyzed and disclosed in the environmental analysis.
6 76	D D	The Rimrock Trail will be directly affected by project actions in section 447. The Rimrock Trail and Morrison Run Trail will be affected by actions in Compartments 447, 448, 449, 450, and 451. The North Country Scenic Trail will be affected by actions in 451, 452, 453 and 454. Hikers using	Non-issue	See response to comment 6 C and 76 C. Also, please note that Alternative 3 in the Environmental Assessment will address the concern of vegetation proposals occurring on the Morrison Run Trail and the North Country Scenic Trail (see comment 32 B, 32 F, and 70 A).

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
		the trails expect a wilderness-like experience. In the proposed project, the trails will be impacted by intensive “treatments” that include clearcutting, herbicide application, fencing, and burning, not to mention the vistas of clearcuts.		
Form letter 6 21 63 76	C E B N E	... the North County National Scenic Trail is being relocated out of a native Mountain Laurel stand (Figure 23) that will be obliterated (without any mitigation of its wildlife habitat) between Rt. 59 and Sugar Bay for Minard Run’s latest OGD expansion.	Non-issue	Beyond the scope of the proposed action. The mentioned trail reroute is outside the project boundary and was decided in a separate NEPA process.
6 76	F F	[regarding effects on mountain laurel] The viability of these unique habitats is also threatened by the clearcut and herbicide activities defined in the proposed Morrison Run Project.	Non-issue	The suggestion that the proposed action would have significant negative effects on wildlife habitat resources is conjectural in nature and not supported by scientific evidence. The effects of the proposed actions on recreation and wildlife will be analyzed and disclosed in the environmental analysis.
Form letter 21	D B	The Forest Service must prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Morrison Run Project because ... 1. the unique characteristics of the area outlined above [i.e., adjacent to Tracy Ridge National Recreation Area and to the Sugar Run/Chestnut Ridge proposed wilderness area. The project area also includes Kinzua Bay, Chappel Bay, Rimrock, Kinzua Beach, Kinzua Heights, Pine Grove, Morrison Run, the National Scenic Byway, the North Country National Scenic Trail, and the Morrison Trail.	Non-issue	This is a statement of opinion. The effects of the proposed action on recreation Scenic Integrity Levels and Recreation Opportunity Spectrum will be analyzed and disclosed in the environmental analysis. The environmental analysis will determine if an EIS is required for the Morrison Run Project.
4	A	I took my second ever backpacking trip along Morrison Run; I saw my first wild coyote along Morrison Run; I took my first winter hike along Morrison Run. To risk the future of such a wonderful place for the sake of a few board feet of lumber or a few days worth of natural gas is	Non-issue	This is a statement of opinion. The analysis of effects from the proposed action on recreation and other forest resources will be analyzed and disclosed in the environmental analysis.

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
		inexcusable and seriously shortsighted. ... The ANF has been a special place to me for years. Hopefully you will make the right decisions that will preserve areas like Morrison Run for future generations.		
5 20 26 27 30 34 45 66	A B A A A A A A	The clear cuts and uses of defoliant that you propose threaten to make unsuitable for recreation all these areas: the Tracy Ridge National Recreation Area and the Sugar Run/Chestnut Ridge proposed wilderness area. ... Such a sacrifice of irreplaceable economic and recreational resources would be an irremediable mistake.	Non-issue	This statement is conjectural and not supported by scientific evidence. The Morrison Run Project does not include activities in or adjacent to the Tracy Ridge NRA or the Chestnut Ridge Wilderness Study Area. The analysis of effects from the proposed action on recreation and other forest resources will be analyzed and disclosed in the environmental analysis.
63	M	<p>3.1.2.1 Intensity: 40CFR 1508.27 (b) 3. Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity to historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas. 40 CFR 1508.27 (b) 3.</p> <p><i>3.1.2.1.1 Proposed Chappel Fork Wilderness Area and Morrison Run Wilderness Area</i> The USFS must analyze the impact of the proposed action on the proposed Chappel Fork Wilderness Area proposed by ADP (with over 2,000 supporters for the proposed wilderness area) and the Morrison Run Wilderness Area proposed by the PA Wilderness Coalition (with almost 7,000 supporters of the wilderness area). The identification of this area by two stakeholders with collectively over 9,000 supporters of the Morrison Run project area for a Wilderness Area must be considered when evaluating the intensity of the action regarding 40 CFR 1508.27 (b) 3.</p>	Non-issue	<p>Already decided by law, regulation or policy. Appropriate activities in this area are already decided by the 2007 Forest Plan. A detailed Wilderness Area Evaluation determined that the Morrison area was not appropriate for wilderness designation and therefore is managed as Management Areas 2.2 and 3.0 (FEIS Appendix C, p. C-25, C-30).</p> <p>Note that the specific effects on recreation of some treatments proposed along the Morrison Trail (Compartment 449, Stands 4 and 7) and North Country Trail (Compartment 454, Stand 22) were identified as significant issues in response to comments 32B and 32F above.</p> <p>The effects of the proposed action on recreation Scenic Integrity Levels and Recreation Opportunity Spectrum will be analyzed and disclosed in the environmental analysis. The proposed actions will follow Forest Plan Goals (p. 13) and appropriate standards and guidelines (p.60-63).</p>

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
		<p><i>3.1.2.1.2 Rimrock, North Country National Scenic Trail and Morrison Run Trail</i></p> <p>The USFS must analyze the impact of the proposed action on Rimrock, the North Country Scenic Trail, and the Morrison Run Trail (Figure 22), which are within the project area. These important cultural and recreation resources must be considered when evaluating the intensity of the action regarding 40 CFR 1508.27 (b) 3. Rimrock will be directly affected by project actions in section 447. The Rimrock and Morrison Run Trail will be affected by actions in Compartments 447, 448, 449, 450, and 451. The North Country Scenic Trail will be affected by actions in 451, 452, 453, 454. Hikers using the trails expect a wilderness-like experience. In the proposed project, the trails will be impacted by intensive “treatments” that include herbicide application, fencing, and burning, not to mention the absence of trees. The timber “treatments” that directly impact the trails include, Compartment 447, Stands 1 (can’t tell what the treatment is from scoping documents), Compartment 449, Stand 7, and 4, and road-building, Compartment 450, 451, 452, All Stands (especially areas over 40 acres), Compartment 453-452, Stands 21, 40, 31 (especially areas over 40 acres), Compartment 454, Stands 44, 22, 49. These impacts will alter the experience of visitors to the forest for years to come.</p>		
TRANSPORTATION				
6	R	With over 3,748 miles of road, over 300 stone pits, and 12,000 to 15,000 active oil and gas wells,	Non-issue	The suggested effects are conjectural in nature and not supported by scientific evidence. The environmental
76	R			

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
		much of the ANF is already an industrialized landscape, not a properly functioning forest ecosystem. Expansion or addition of pits and roads (almost 11 miles of road in the proposed Morrison Run Vegetative Management Project) continues the destruction of undisturbed wildlife habitat and forest ecosystems. The USFS must conduct an EIS that analyzes the cumulative impacts of roads and stone pits on the health of the forest ecosystem, water quality, and species viability before there is any additional road construction or road upgrades.		analysis will determine if an EIS is required for the Morrison Run Project.
15	B	Road work (including improvements to existing FS roads and construction of new roads) and timber harvesting create conditions that allow easier oil and gas development.	Non-issue	This is a statement of opinion.
63	X	The notion that a six-year old roads analysis can somehow “discuss[] current conditions of roads...” is profoundly illogical. The 2003 Forest-wide Roads Analysis stated that there were 2,748 miles of roads on the Allegheny, including 1,236 non-Forest Service roads, most of which were oil and gas roads. USDA-FS 2003, p. 12. On May 18, 2008, however, Bradford District Ranger sent an email to ADP Board President Bill Belitskus with an attached document titled “ANF Response to ADP’s Questions regarding Oil and Gas Road Estimates.” Considering this document is approximately 1 ½ years old, it is likely that the miles of new roads constructed since 2003 is closer to, if not over 1,000 miles. That means there would be approximately 2,236 miles of non-Forest Service road, a dramatic difference from what the Forest Service relies on in the DSEIS. At what point will “the Forest [] revise this estimate”	Non-issue	This is a statement of opinion. The project-level roads analysis for the Morrison Run Project will use the most up-to-date information on road densities based on field reconnaissance.

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
		from the 2003 Forest-wide Roads Analysis? It should have been updated through forest plan revision. It must be updated now in this DSEIS.		
63	II	With over 3,748 miles of road, over 300 stone pits, and 12,000 to 15,000 active oil and gas wells, the ANF distinguishes itself as likely the most abused forest in the FS system. Expansion or addition of pits and roads (almost 11 miles of road in the proposed Morrison Run Project) is irresponsible and continues to destroy the other uses of the forest (not to mention the ecosystem) except for the extractive use. The USFS must conduct an EIS that analyzes the cumulative impacts of roads and stone pits on the health of the forest ecosystem, water quality, and species viability.	Non-issue	The suggested effects are conjectural in nature and not supported by scientific evidence. The environmental analysis will determine if an EIS is required for the Morrison Run Project.
VEGETATION				
Form letter 21	G B	The Forest Service must prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Morrison Run Project because ... The Forest Service's identification of proposed clear-cut areas over 40 acres in size as "temporary openings" (40 CFR 1508.27 (b) 7).	Non-issue	This has already been decided by law, regulation or policy. The 2007 ANF LRMP addresses situations in which the creation of temporary openings are appropriate and the procedures to follow in such cases (p. 68).
6 76	K K	The Forest Service must disclose in an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) how much early successional habitat is available on [private and other agency] lands before claiming there is a need for clearcutting trees and herbicide use on proposed Wilderness Areas of the ANF. The Forest Service must also analyze the nature and extent of early successional habitat on nearby non-National Forest System lands in the EIS for the Morrison Run Project. Taking into account the amount of early successional habitat on much of Pennsylvania's public and private forests as well	Non-significant Issue	This issue has already been decided by law, regulation or policy. Documentation supporting the suitability of the proposed activities is in the 2007 Forest Plan and the analysis of desired conditions is contained in the Final EIS for the Forest Plan. The environmental analysis will determine if an EIS is required for the Morrison Run Project.

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
		as on nearby public and private forestry lands in New York, it is quite clear that there is no shortage of early successional habitat lands across Pennsylvania, including the Allegheny region.		
7	C	...we believe the AMFC treatments on the Morrison Run Project should be established as part of a larger restoration study that compares a variety of alternate treatments with the goal of restoring late-successional forest attributes. The Morrison Run Project may provide a perfect opportunity to combine landscape level management with a study designed to compare various AMFC treatments to determine which works best as a restoration tool. The Nature Conservancy would be very interested in collaborating on such a project...	Non-issue	Comment noted.
37	A	The ANF refuses to recognize the data about the negative effects of timber harvesting. Can you show data that cutting the wood out of the forest would improve ecosystem health? This is the final curtain- there have been many years of lies to the public and I plan to contact Congress and make sure that something is done this time.	Non-issue	This is a statement of opinion. Documentation supporting the suitability of the proposed activities is in the 2007 Forest Plan and the analysis of desired conditions is contained in the Final EIS for the Forest Plan. The environmental analysis for the Morrison Run Project will disclose the effects of vegetation management activities in the project area.
43	A	I have property near the Bradford Ranger District Office. Will there be any clear-cut timber harvest on my property? I am a surface and sub-surface owner.	Non-issue	Request for information. Forest Service staff contacted commenter 12/2010.
48	A	I'm writing to oppose the Morrison Run Project, specifically, the clear cutting of more than 5000 acres in the Allegheny National Forest, associated and spraying with herbicide, and road construction. Is this project really necessary? The project will jeopardize possible future designation of this area as Wilderness. I'm concerned that if this project proceeds it will impair the Forest	Non-issue	This is a statement of opinion. Documentation supporting the suitability of the proposed activities is in the 2007 Forest Plan and the analysis of desired conditions is contained in the Final EIS for the Forest Plan. The analysis of effects from the proposed action will be disclosed in the environmental analysis. The environmental analysis

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
		Service's ability to adequately protect the area from the environmental impacts of Marcellus gas drilling. I think the next step should be a comprehensive Environmental Impact Statement with at least one public hearing.		will determine if an EIS is required for the Morrison Run Project.
52	B	The even-aged management (clear-cuts) of MA 3.0 which encompasses 44% of the project area in counter-productive to your purpose and need as outline in sections D, E, G, H, and I. The FS is aware that even-aged management promotes insect infestation, disease, erosion of soil, thus soil quality, and increases sedimentation in streams, therefore diminishing aquatic habitat diversity. Since this project is only one of many project the ANF has proposed this year, the reference [by the Forest Service] to extensive timber harvesting in the last century should be enough to remind the FS of the devastation effects of any clear cutting. "ecological research strongly implies that the life history of replacement trees will be materially different from that of their giant predecessors, even when no effort is made to change the species mix for commercial purposes", from p. 129 in The Dying of the Trees by Charles E. Little.	Non-issue	The suggested effects are conjectural and not supported by scientific evidence. This issue has already been decided by law, regulation or policy. Documentation supporting the suitability of the proposed activities is in the 2007 Forest Plan and the analysis of desired conditions is contained in the Final EIS for the Forest Plan.
63	FF	The USFS must prepare an EIS to study the need to create early and late structural Habitat. The Forest Service must consider available early successional habitat on private and other agency lands within the proclamation boundary and surrounding the Allegheny National Forest. The Forest Service must disclose in an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) how much early successional habitat is available on these other lands before claiming there is a need to cut trees on the national forest. The Forest Service must	Non-issue	This issue has already been decided by law, regulation or policy. Documentation supporting the suitability of the proposed activities is in the 2007 Forest Plan and the analysis of desired conditions is contained in the Final EIS for the Forest Plan. The environmental analysis will determine if an EIS is required for the Morrison Run Project.

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
		analyze the early successional habitat on non-National Forest System lands in an EIS for the Morrison Run Project. The truth of the matter is that most of Pennsylvania's forestland is privately owned and, when considered with other agency lands, such as State Game Lands, which are heavily managed for early successional habitat, it is quite clear that there is certainly no shortage of early successional habitat across the state, including the Allegheny region. If anything, the habitat that is in short supply is remote, unfragmented forests and that is where the Forest Service's management priorities should be – not creating more early successional habitat. The lack of this analysis also adds to the weight of the intensity of the project when determining its significance regarding 40 CFR 1508.27 (b) (see also Section 3.1.2). The regulation states, "Responsible officials must bear in mind that more than one agency may make decisions about partial aspects of a major action."		
WILDLIFE/PLANTS				
6 76	G G	The USFS must conduct an EIS on the proposed Morrison Run project given the proximity of this project to the headwater tributaries within the 13% area. The Morrison Run project will very likely impact freshwater species including the endangered northern riffleshell and clubshell mussels.	Non-issue	The suggestion that the proposed action would adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its critical habitat is conjectural in nature and not supported by scientific evidence. Analysis of the effects of the proposed action on threatened and endangered species will be in the Biological Assessment. The environmental analysis will determine if an EIS is required for the Morrison Run Project.
6 76	H H	The cumulative impact from OGD and from the over 19,000 acres of even-aged management and over 7,000 acres of herbicide application in proposed logging projects on the ANF this year to	Non-issue	This is a statement of opinion. Analysis of the effects of the proposed action on management indicator species and RFSS will be in the Biological Evaluation and Wildlife Report. The environmental analysis will

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
		Goshawk habitat must be analyzed in the EIS.		determine if an EIS is required for the Morrison Run Project.
Form letter 21	H B	The Forest Service must prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Morrison Run Project because ... 4) The fact that a portion of the project area will directly affect the Allegheny River and Reservoir, home to endangered and threatened species of mussels. [40 CFR 1508.27 (b) 9)]	Non-issue	The suggestion that the proposed actions would adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its critical habitat is conjectural in nature and not supported by scientific evidence. Analysis of the effects of the proposed action on threatened and endangered species will be in the Biological Assessment. The environmental analysis will determine if an EIS is required for the Morrison Run Project.
Form letter 21 63	I B BB	The Forest Service must prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Morrison Run Project because ... The cumulative effect that the proposed action will have on the continued fragmentation of the ANF, which will certainly threaten habitat for species like the Goshawk, Cerulean Warbler, and others which need large areas of un-fragmented habitat. The project will also add to the cumulative impact on the 78 species with potential viability concerns on the ANF (five are threatened or endangered with two candidate species, 61 are RFSS with two candidate species) (USDA FS 2007b). [40 CFR 1508.27 (b) 9)]	Non-issue	The suggestion that the proposed actions would adversely affect the northern goshawk, cerulean warbler, and other species is conjectural in nature and not supported by scientific evidence. Analysis of the effects of the proposed action on management indicator species and RFSS will be in the Biological Evaluation and Wildlife Report. The environmental analysis will determine if an EIS is required for the Morrison Run Project.
6 76	I I	The Forest Service must conduct an analysis of the site-specific treatment areas for the presence of threatened and endangered species and for the 78 species with potential viability concerns in the ANF (five are threatened or endangered with two candidate species, 61 are RFSS with two candidate species). The Forest Service must also address the cumulative impacts from OGD to these species on multiple levels (including site-specific, project area, ANF, and regional) since	Non-issue	This is a statement of opinion. This comment includes suggestions for the environmental analysis.

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
		and the ANF's vegetative management plan was not developed taking into account the cumulative impact of OGD as a significant and primary issue.		
6 76	J J	The current 2007 Forest Plan does not analyze the potential impact of logging and OGD activity on viability for numerous species on the forest including the newly re-introduced fisher and river otters.	Non-issue	Beyond the scope of the proposed action. The species surveyed for project-level analysis is decided by the 2007 Forest Plan and Forest Service regional policies.
63	J	The NTP makes clear an issue that must be addressed with OGD in the project area and across the ANF. The NTP states, "Mulch straw is preferred in all cases. If hay is used, the source location and supplier shall be provided and every attempt should be made to obtain hay free of non-native invasive species." Clearly, the huge areas disturbed and mulched by OGD are a major potential source for invasive species. The Forest Service must study the introduction of non-native invasive species from OGD practices as part of the contextual significance of the proposed action in the Morrison Run Project area.	Non-issue	Beyond the scope of this proposed action. The proposed action does not include private oil and gas development. The introduction and spread of non-native invasive species will be analyzed and disclosed in the environmental analysis.
63	O	The USFS must conduct an EIS on the proposed Morrison Run project given the proximity of this project to the headwater tributaries within the 13% area. The Morrison Run project will impact freshwater species including the endangered northern riffleshell and clubshell mussels. The toxicity of glyphosate (and the surfactants commonly used with this herbicide) to aquatic species is widely accepted. The use of these compounds in the sub-basins that form the habitat of these endangered species is, at least irresponsible, and likely a violation of the Endangered Species Act.	Non-issue	The suggestion that the proposed actions would adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its critical habitat is conjectural in nature and not supported by scientific evidence. Analysis of the effects of the proposed action on threatened and endangered species will be in the Biological Assessment. The result of the environmental analysis will determine if an EIS is required for the Morrison Run Project.
63	P	The 2007 Forest Plan Biological Evaluation	Non-issue	The suggested effects from timber treatments are

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
		includes two tables analyzing the sediment load of two tributaries to the Allegheny River within the 13% area. ³² One tributary, Grunder Run, has extensive oil and gas development surrounding it. The other tributary, Hedgehog Run, is located in the Allegheny Front National Recreation Area and has no oil and gas development around it yet. The results clearly document that the tributary with more oil and gas development around it has higher sediment loads, thus impacting species such as clubshell and northern riffleshell mussels, which are very sensitive to sedimentation. Based on the reasonable foreseeable impacts of OGD on clubshell and northern riffleshell mussel habitat the USFS should not be proposing activities such as the timber “treatments” proposed in the Morrison Run Project that would exacerbate the known impacts of OGD.		<p>conjectural in nature and not supported by scientific evidence.</p> <p>Analysis of the effects of the proposed action on threatened and endangered species will be in the Biological Assessment. The cumulative effects analysis will also take into account the proposed actions in the context of private oil and gas activity.</p>
63	Q	<p>The Forest Service is proposing over 242 acres of even-aged “treatments,” including fencing, herbicide application, and burning, release, and clearing of undesirable species in MA 2.2. The 2007 Forest Plan identifies MA 2.2 as an area, which should be managed for, “Wildlife management emphasizes species with viability concerns, remote and interior species with high sensitivity to disturbance, and protection of unique micro and macro habitats (e.g. rock/boulder outcroppings and seasonal nesting and cover habitat).</p> <p>“Special emphasis should be given to identifying and implementing measures to reduce adverse impacts on the resource objectives of this management area” [USFS ANF 2007 LRMP p. 112].</p> <p>The Forest Service released a Draft SEIS for the</p>	Non-issue	<p>The suggested effects are conjectural in nature and not supported by scientific evidence.</p> <p>The proposed activities are consistent with Management Area designations in the 2007 ANF Forest Plan. The effects of the proposed action on wildlife will be analyzed in the Morrison Run Biological Assessment, Biological Evaluation, and Wildlife Report.</p>

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
		2007 Forest Plan in which every species listed as having viability concerns was declining over the planning period for several reasons, most notably the high level of oil and gas development on the Allegheny. The Forest Service simply cannot continue to operate its timber program like it is 1989. The Forest Service must take steps to actually protect wildlife habitat, not further impact it with even-aged management that only exacerbates the already extensive, forest-wide impacts of oil and gas development.		
63	R	<p>Within the Morrison Run project boundary are numerous high quality aquatic habitats, which will be adversely affected by the actions proposed in the Morrison Run project (e.g., by clearcutting, and herbiciding). Many of the streams and creeks in the project area are classified as High Quality, Cold Water Fisheries (HQ-CWF), which must be afforded special protection (Figure 24). Additionally, the Pennsylvania Fish And Boat Commission recognizes numerous streams and creeks listed below as Naturally Reproducing Trout Streams (NRTS).</p> <p>These important aquatic habitats must be protected. The proposed action in the Morrison Run Project will damage these streams and creeks with increased runoff and siltation, stream warming from canopy openings, and pollution from herbicide applications. The USFS must conduct an EIS to determine the impact of the project on these important aquatic habitats and on the species that inhabit them.</p>	Non-issue	<p>The suggested adverse effects are conjectural in nature and not supported by scientific evidence.</p> <p>The effects of the proposed activities will be addressed in the environmental analysis. The environmental analysis will determine if an EIS is required for the Morrison Run Project.</p>
63	AA	<i>Northern goshawks are considered "management indicators". They are considered "sensitive to change", and their well being often can provide</i>	Non-issue	<p>This is a suggestion for the environmental analysis.</p> <p>Analysis of the effects of the proposed action on the</p>

Letter	Comment	Comment Language	Issue Analysis	Rationale
		<p><i>clues to problems with habitat change.</i></p> <p>Regarding the northern goshawk the Forest Service states:</p> <p>“...gaps in nesting habitat exist due to high density roads and oil, gas, and mineral (OGM) activity. Although recent nesting success has dropped for unknown reasons, the ANF has supported a fairly stable population for the last 15 years...The change in viability for the northern goshawk results from anticipated future oil and gas (OGM) development. It is anticipated that by 2020, between 25 and 30 percent of the proclamation boundary will have levels of oil and gas (OGM) activity that create unsuitable or marginally suitable northern goshawk habitat, whereas by 2060, unsuitable habitat could occur on up to 50 percent of the proclamation boundary.”</p> <p>The cumulative impact from OGD and from the over 19,000 acres of even-aged management and over 7,000 acres of herbicide application in proposed logging projects on the ANF this year to Goshawk habitat must be analyzed in an EIS.</p>		<p>northern goshawk and other management indicator species will be in the Biological Evaluation and Wildlife Report for the Morrison Run Project. This project does not include proposed private oil and gas development. The environmental analysis will determine if an EIS is required for the Morrison Run Project.</p>